

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|--|-----------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| 10/748,971 | 12/30/2003 | Ju-Kil Lee | 21C-0104 | 21C-0104 8814 | |
| 23413 | 7590 11/08/2006 | | EXAM | EXAMINER | |
| CANTOR COLBURN, LLP 55 GRIFFIN ROAD SOUTH | | | GILLESPIE, | GILLESPIE, BENJAMIN | |
| | D, CT 06002 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| • | • | | 1711 | | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 11/08/2006 | DATE MAILED: 11/08/2006 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|--|--|--|---|--------------|
| | | 10/748,971 | LEE ET AL. | ` |
| Office Action Summary | | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | | Benjamin J. Gillespie | 1711 | |
| The | MAILING DATE of this communicati | | | ddress |
| Period for Rep | ly · | | | |
| WHICHEVE - Extensions of after SIX (6) N - If NO period fo - Failure to reply Any reply rece | NED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR IT IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING THE MAILIN | NG DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reption. It period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH by statute, cause the application to become ABA | ATION. Ny be timely filed HS from the mailing date of this on NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). | • |
| Status | | | | |
| 1)⊠ Respo | onsive to communication(s) filed or | 09/05/2006 | | |
| • | | This action is non-final. | | |
| · <u> </u> | this application is in condition for a | | rs, prosecution as to th | e merits is |
| •— | d in accordance with the practice u | • | • | |
| Disposition of | Claims | | | |
| 4)⊠ Claim | (s) <u>1-9</u> is/are pending in the applica | ation. | | |
| • | the above claim(s) 8 and 9 is/are | | | |
| - | (s) is/are allowed. | | | |
| · | (s) <u>1-7</u> is/are rejected. | | | |
| 7) Claim | (s) is/are objected to. | | | |
| 8) Claim | (s) are subject to restriction | and/or election requirement. | | |
| Application Pa | pers | | | |
| 9)∏ The sp | ecification is objected to by the Ex | aminer. | | |
| | awing(s) filed on is/are: a)[| | the Examiner. | |
| | ant may not request that any objection | | | |
| | cement drawing sheet(s) including the | | • | FR 1.121(d). |
| 11) The oa | ath or declaration is objected to by | the Examiner. Note the attached | Office Action or form P | TO-152. |
| Priority under 3 | 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | • | , |
| 12) Acknow | wledgment is made of a claim for fo | oreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 1 | I19(a)-(d) or (f). | |
| a)∏ All | b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of: | | | |
| 1. | Certified copies of the priority docu | uments have been received. | | |
| 2. | Certified copies of the priority docu | uments have been received in Ap | plication No | |
| 3.□ | Copies of the certified copies of th | e priority documents have been re | eceived in this Nationa | l Stage |
| | application from the International E | Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | | |
| * See the | attached detailed Office action for | a list of the certified copies not re | eceived. | |
| | • | | | |
| Attachmost/s\ | - , | | | |
| Attachment(s) Notice of Refe | erences Cited (PTO-892) | 4) Thenday Su | mmary (PTO-413) | |
| | ftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9 | 48) Paper No(s)/ | Mail Date | |
| 3) 🔲 Information D | isclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | | ormal Patent Application | • |
| Paper No(s)/N | viaii Dale | رب | | |

Application/Control Number: 10/748,971

Art Unit: 1711

1. Newly submitted claims 8 and 9 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: New claims 8 and 9 require the presence of a steel sheet, and the position is taken that the presence of the steel sheet causes the claims to be distinct from the composition of claim 1. Furthermore the inventions are considered to be independent because they have different design features, and modes of operation.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 8 and 9 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Regarding the material properties of claim 1, there is no discussion of H values for the polyurethane system besides that in the examples of the specification. The values disclosed in the examples are not shown to be harder than H as claimed by applicant, and therefore do not

Application/Control Number: 10/748,971 Page 3

Art Unit: 1711

have the support to claim values greater than H. Furthermore the processability range of 2T or lower is not supported in the specification as the applicant only teaches for values of 1T and 2T. Therefore no range can be applied in the claim based on the values disclosed in the examples because one cannot extrapolate properties or values from examples for the purpose of supporting claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Radovich ('924). Radovich discloses reacting polyester polyol having the same molecular weight range (col 1 lines 62-68) and made from the same acids and alcohols (col 2 lines 20-45) with the same diisocyanate (top col 5) using deficient stoichiometric amounts of diisocyanate (see Table 1). Applicants' arguments have been taken into consideration but are not persuasive. Regarding amended claim 1, the applicant has not conclusively excluded other aspects of the paint film, which may cause hardness values to overlap the claimed range. For example the inclusion of other additives or additional processing, which would not change the chemical composition of the polyurethane, but may increase the hardness. Finally, applicant has not conclusively established that the composition as set forth within the reference does not inherently possess the claimed properties.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Application/Control Number: 10/748,971 Page 4

Art Unit: 1711

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

RABON SERGENT PRIMARY EXAMINER